

**BEFORE THE  
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
Lucas State Office Building, 4<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
eab.iowa.gov**

---

**FALAH ALYASSERY**

Claimant

and

**PMX INDUSTRIES INC**

Employer

: **APPEAL NUMBER:** 23B-UI-01989

: **ALJ HEARING NUMBER:** 23A-UI-01989

:

: **EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD**

:

**DECISION**

:

:

:

**NOTICE**

**THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL** unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT** IS FILED WITHIN **30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

**SECTION:** 96.5-2-A

**DECISION**

**UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED**

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds it cannot affirm the administrative law judge's decision. The Employment Appeal Board **REVERSES** as set forth below.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The Employment Appeal Board adopts the administrative law judge's findings of fact with the following modification to the fourth paragraph:

The Claimant missed work on May 17, 2022, and notified the Employer prior to the start of his shift but did not provide a reason for the absence. The Employer issued the Claimant a verbal warning on May 19. The Claimant missed work on August 3, and notified the employer prior to the start of his shift but did not provide a reason for the absence. The Employer issued him a written warning related to attendance. The Claimant missed work on November 10, and notified the Employer prior to the start of his shift but did not provide a reason for the absence. The Employer suspended the Claimant for one-day due to his absenteeism.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the following reasons, the Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2) provides, in relevant part:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The disqualification shall continue until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

...

d. For the purposes of this subsection, “*misconduct*” means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee’s contract of employment. Misconduct is limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer’s interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or even design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer’s interests or of the employee’s duties and obligations to the employer. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

...

(9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32 provides, in relevant part:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. “Misconduct” is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to

expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand, mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

...

(7) Excessive unexcused absenteeism. Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer.

The Iowa Supreme Court has held this definition of misconduct accurately reflects the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The Employer has the burden to prove the Claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the Employer made a correct decision in separating the claimant, but whether the Claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7); see *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190, n. 1 (Iowa 1984) holding "rule [2]4.32(7)...accurately states the law."

The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are twofold. First, the absences must be excessive. *Sallis v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). The term "absenteeism" includes tardiness or leaving early. An absence is an extended tardiness, and an incident of tardiness is a limited absence. The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. *Higgins* at 192.

Second, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper* at 10. The requirement of "unexcused" can be satisfied in two ways. An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for "reasonable grounds," *Higgins* at 191, or because it was not "properly reported," holding excused absences are those "with appropriate notice." *Cosper* at 10. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. *Higgins, supra*. Where the Employer shows that there was no excuse given at the time of the absence or tardy and none appears in the record of the hearing then that absence or tardy is not for an excused reason.

It is the duty of the Board as the ultimate trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The Board, as the finder of fact, may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, as well as the weight to give other evidence, a Board member should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In determining the facts, and deciding what evidence to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other evidence the Board believes; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). The Board also gives weight to the opinion of the Administrative Law Judge concerning credibility and weight of evidence, particularly where the hearing is in-person, although the Board is not bound by that opinion. Iowa Code §17A.10(3); *Iowa State Fairgrounds Security v. Iowa Civil Rights Commission*, 322 N.W.2d 293, 294 (Iowa 1982). We also note that the three Members of this Board each listens to the digital recording of this hearing and each has equal access to factors such as tone of voice, hesitancy in responding, etc. as the Administrative Law Judge.

The findings of fact show how we have resolved the disputed factual issues in this case. We have carefully weighed the credibility of the witnesses and the reliability of the evidence considering the applicable factors listed above, and the Board's collective common sense and experience. We have found credible the Employer's contention that the Claimant missed work on the days identified. We do not find credible the Claimant's blanket denial that he missed work when he later provided contradictory evidence and his reticence to answer direct questions related to the absences.

An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits; however, an employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified as to when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The claimant had three absences that were properly reported but for which no excuse was provided either to the Employer or for the hearing. Therefore, they are considered unexcused absences for purposes of unemployment insurance benefits. The Employer has established that the Claimant was aware that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment. The Claimant's final absence was not excused because the Claimant did not miss work to take his son to the hospital and he did not report to work once he learned that he would not be taking his son to the hospital. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

## **DECISION:**

The administrative law judge's decision dated March 20, 2023 is **REVERSED**. The Employment Appeal Board concludes that the Claimant was discharged for job-related misconduct. Accordingly, benefits are denied.

Whether the Claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits as a result of this decision is remanded to the Benefits Bureau.

---

James M. Strohman

---

Ashley R. Koopmans

---

Myron R. Linn

SRC/fnv